



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/375,328	08/17/1999	AHMAD R. ANSARI	M-7669-US	4890
33031	7590	02/12/2004	EXAMINER	
CAMPBELL STEPHENSON ASCOLESE, LLP 4807 SPICEWOOD SPRINGS RD. BLDG. 4, SUITE 201 AUSTIN, TX 78759			ELLIS, RICHARD L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2183	

DATE MAILED: 02/12/2004

16

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

2

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/375,328

Applicant(s)

ANSARI, AHMAD R.

Examiner

Richard Ellis

Art Unit

2183

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 November 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 53-54, 56-66, 69-78 and 80-88 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 53-54, 56-66, 69-78, 80-88 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

1. Claims 53-54, 56-66, 69-78, and 80-88 remain for examination.
2. The text of those sections of Title 35, US Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office Action.
3. Claim 53-54, 56-66, 69-78, and 80-88 are rejected under 35 USC § 103 as being unpatentable over Tanaka et al., U.S. patent 4,910,667, in view of Birrittella et al., U.S. Patent 6,266,759.

Tanaka et al. and Birrittella et al. were cited as prior art references in paper number 10, mailed June 20, 2003.

4. The rejections are respectfully maintained and incorporated by reference as set forth in the last office action, paper number 10, mailed June 20, 2003.
5. Applicant's arguments filed November 24, 2003, paper number 15, have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive.
6. In the remarks, applicant argues in substance:
  - 6.1. That: "In rejecting claim 55, the Office Action alleges that Birrittella teaches the added limitations of claim 53 citing column 6, lines 2-9. Applicant has reviewed column 2, [sic] lines 6-9 of Birrittella and can find no teaching or fair suggestion of generating a vector transfer unit exception if a second program attempts to transfer vector data between memory and a register of the register file via any vector buffer of the vector buffer pole, [sic] if said configuration register indicates that said vector buffer is in use, either alone or in combination with the remaining limitations of independent claim 53. Indeed, column 6, line 2-9 fails to teach or fairly suggest that actions are dependent upon second program operation."

This is not found persuasive because it appears that applicant is attempting to import limitations from the specification into the claims:

"limitations appearing in the specification will not be read into the claims, and ... interpreting what is meant by a word in a claim 'is not to be confused with adding an extraneous limitation appearing in the specification, which is improper'." *Intervet Am., v. Kee-Vet Labs.*, 12 USPQ2d 1474, 1476 (Fed. Cir. 1989)(citation omitted).

"it is entirely proper to use the specification to interpret what the patentee meant by a word or phrase in the claim, ... this is not to be confused with adding an extraneous limitation appearing in the specification, which is improper. By 'extraneous,' we mean a limitation read into a claim from the specification wholly apart from any need to interpret ... particular words or phrases in the claim." *In re Paulsen*, 31 USPQ2d 1671, 1674 (Fed. Cir. 1994). (Emphasis added)

Applicant's amended claims merely state "generating a vector transfer unit exception" with no further claimed definition of what is meant by the word "exception". From a perusal of the specification it is clear that applicant intends "exception" to mean its ordinary meaning, that of:

**"exception** - In a computer, a condition which is out of the ordinary in normal task execution;" (*Modern Dictionary of Electronics*, Sixth Edition, Rudolf F. Graf, 1988)

In Birrittella et al., the "ordinary in normal task execution" is the processing of vector instructions. Therefore, at col. 6 lines 2-6 when Birrittella et al. states that "block 356 stalls all instructions currently executing in block 330" it has produced "a condition" (a stall, or the halt of execution of instructions) which is "out of the ordinary in normal task execution" (ordinary in Birrittella et al. being to execute instructions).

Therefore, to the extent of applicant's broadly claimed "exception" in the claims, Birrittella et al. does indeed teach a manner of operation which is an "exception" as the meaning of that term is commonly understood.

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR § 1.136(a). The practice of automatically extending the shortened statutory period an additional month upon the filing of a timely first response to a final rejection has been discontinued by the Office. See 1021 TMOG 35.

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE TO THIS FINAL ACTION IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS ACTION. IN THE EVENT A FIRST RESPONSE IS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION AND THE ADVISORY ACTION IS NOT MAILED UNTIL AFTER THE END OF THE THREE-MONTH SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD, THEN THE SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD WILL EXPIRE ON THE DATE THE ADVISORY ACTION IS MAILED, AND ANY EXTENSION FEE PURSUANT TO 37 CFR § 1.136(a) WILL BE CALCULATED FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THE ADVISORY ACTION. IN NO EVENT WILL THE STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE EXPIRE LATER THAN SIX MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Richard Ellis whose telephone number is (703) 305-9690. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 7am to 5pm.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Eddie Chan, can be reached on (703) 305-9712. The fax phone number for the USPTO is: (703)872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.



Richard Ellis  
February 10, 2004